



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON DC 20007

In re Patent No. 7,445,853
Issued: November 4, 2008
Application No. 10/531,414
Filed: April 15, 2005
Dkt. No.: 016782-0324

COPY MAILED

JUN 15 2009

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

:
: PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT
:
:
:

This is a decision on the "REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R §1.705", filed December 10, 2008. This matter is being properly treated as an application for patent term adjustment pursuant to 37 CFR 1.705(d).

The request for reconsideration of patent term adjustment (PTA) is **DISMISSED**.

The above-identified application matured into U.S. Pat. No. 7,445, 853 on November 4, 2008. The patent issued with a PTA 295 days. The request for reconsideration of patent term adjustment was timely filed within two months of the issue date of the patent. See, 37 CFR 1.705(d). Patentees request that the patent term adjustment be increased from 295 days to 498 days.

Patentees request reconsideration of the patent term adjustment based on the decision in Wyeth v. Dudas, 580 F. Supp. 2d 138, 88 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1538 (D.D.C. 2008). Patentees contend that pursuant to Wyeth, a PTO delay under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A) overlaps with a delay under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) only if the delays occur on the same day.

Patentees assert that the period of adjustment due to the three year delay by the Office, pursuant to 37 CFR 1.702(b), of 203 days and the period of adjustment due to examination delay, pursuant to 37 CFR 1.702(a)(1), of 295 days do not overlap as these periods do not occur on the same day. Patentees assert that this 203-day period is calculated based on the application having fulfilled the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 371 in an international application on April 15, 2005, and the patent having been issued on November 4, 2008. Patentees assert that in addition to this 203-day period, they are entitled to a period of adjustment due to examination delay pursuant to 37 CFR 1.702(a)(1) of 295 days.

Under 37 CFR 1.703(f), patentees are entitled to a period of patent term adjustment equal to the period of delays based on the grounds set forth in 37 CFR 1.702 reduced by the period of time equal to the period of time during which patentees failed to engage in reasonable efforts to

conclude prosecution pursuant to 37 CFR 1.704. In other words, patentees are entitled to the period of Office delay reduced by the period of applicant delay.

Patentees do not dispute that the total period of Office delay is the sum of the period of three years delay and the period of examination delay, to the extent that these periods of delay are not overlapping. However, in effect, patentees contend that no portion of the three year delay period overlaps with the period of examination delay. Accordingly, patentees submit that the total period of adjustment for Office delay is 498 days (the sum of the period of three year delay (203 days) and the period of examination delay (295 days), reduced by zero days of overlap). As such, patentees assert entitlement to a patent term adjustment of 498 days (295 days *plus* 203 days *less* zero days of overlap *less* zero days of applicant delay).

The Office agrees that as of the issuance of the patent on November 4, 2008, the application was pending three years and 201 days after the national stage commenced under 35 U.S.C. 371(b) or (f) in an international application. The Office agrees that certain action was not taken within a specified time frame, and, thus, the entry of a period of adjustment of 295 days is correct. At issue is whether patentees should accrue an additional 201 days of patent term adjustment for the Office taking in excess of three years to issue the patent as well as 295 days for Office failure to take a certain action within a specified time frame (or examination delay).

The Office contends that 201 days overlap. Patentees' calculation of the period of overlap is inconsistent with the Office's interpretation of this provision. 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) limits the adjustment of patent term, as follows:

To the extent that the periods of delay attributable to grounds specified in paragraph (1) overlap, the period of any adjustment granted under this subsection shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

Likewise, 35 CFR 1.703(f) provides that:

To the extent that periods of delay attributable to the grounds specified in § 1.702 overlap, the period of adjustment granted under this section shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

As explained in Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f) and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A), 69 Fed. Reg. 34283 (June 21, 2004), the Office interprets 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) as permitting either patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iv), or patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), but not as permitting patent term adjustment under both 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iv) and 154(b)(1)(B). Accordingly, the Office implements the overlap provision as follows:

If an application is entitled to an adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), the entire period during which the application was pending (except for periods excluded under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)), and not just the period beginning three years after the actual

filings date of the application, is the period of delay under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay overlap under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A). Thus, any days of delay for Office issuance of the patent more than 3 years after the filing date of the application, which overlap with the days of patent term adjustment accorded prior to the issuance of the patent will not result in any additional patent term adjustment. See 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A), and 37 CFR § 1.703(f). See Changes to Implement Patent Term Adjustment Under Twenty Year Term; Final Rule, 65 Fed. Reg. 56366 (Sept. 18, 2000). See, also, Revision of Patent Term Extension and Patent Term Adjustment Provisions; Final Rule, 69 Fed. Reg. 21704 (April 22, 2004), 1282 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 100 (May 18, 2004). See, also, Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f) and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A), 69 Fed. Reg. 34283 (June 21, 2004).

The current wording of § 1.703(f) was revised in response to the misinterpretation of this provision by a number of Patentees. The rule was slightly revised to more closely track the corresponding language of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A). The relevant portion differs only to the extent that the statute refers back to provisions of the statute whereas the rule refers back to sections of the rule. This was not a substantive change to the rule nor did it reflect a change of the Office's interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A). As stated in the Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f) and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A), the Office has consistently taken the position that if an application is entitled to an adjustment under the three-year pendency provision of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), the entire period during which the application was pending before the Office (except for periods excluded under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)), and not just the period beginning three years after the actual filing date of the application, is the relevant period under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay "overlap" under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A).

This interpretation is consistent with the statute. Taken together the statute and rule provide that to the extent that periods of delay attributable to grounds specified in 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1) and in corresponding § 1.702 overlap, the period of adjustment granted shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed. The grounds specified in these sections cover the A) guarantee of prompt Patent and Trademark Office responses, B) guarantee of no more than 3-year application pendency, and C) guarantee or adjustments for delays due to interference, secrecy orders and appeals. A section by section analysis of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) specifically provides that:

Section 4402 imposes limitations on restoration of term. In general, pursuant to [35 U.S.C.] 154(b)(2)(A)-(C), total adjustments granted for restorations under [35 U.S.C.] 154](b)(1) are reduced as follows: (1) To the extent that there are multiple grounds for extending the term of a patent that may exist simultaneously (e.g., delay due to a secrecy order under [35 U.S.C.] 181 and administrative delay under [35 U.S.C.] 154(b)(1)(A)),

the term should not be extended for each ground of delay but only for the actual number of days that the issuance of a patent was delayed; See, 145 Cong. Rec. S14,718¹.

As such, the period for over three-year pendency does not overlap only to the extent that the actual dates in the period beginning three years after the national stage commenced under 35 U.S.C. 371(b) or (f) in an international application overlap with the actual dates in the periods for failure of the Office to take action within specified time frames. In other words, consideration of the overlap does not begin three years after the national stage commenced under 35 U.S.C. 371(b) or (f) in an international application.

In this instance, the relevant period under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay "overlap" under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) is the entire period during which the application was pending before the Office, April 15, 2005, to the date the patent issued on November 4, 2008. Prior to the issuance of the patent, 295 days of patent term adjustment were accorded for the Office failing to respond within a specified time frame during the pendency of the application.

The application actually issued three years and 201 days after the national stage commenced under 35 U.S.C. 371(b) or (f) in an international application. However, the Office did not delay 295 days and then delay an additional 201 days. Accordingly, 295 days of patent term adjustment (not 295 days and 201 days) was properly entered because the period of delay of 201 days attributable to the delay in the issuance of the patent overlaps with the adjustment of 295 days attributable to grounds specified in § 1.702(a)(1). Entry of both periods is not warranted.

In view thereof, no adjustment to the patent term will be made.

The Office acknowledges submission of the required application fee of \$200.00. See, 37 CFR 1.18(e). The request for refund of the required application fee is hereby DISMISSED. Submission of the application fee is a prerequisite prior to treatment on the merits of any application for patent term adjustment.

Telephone inquiries specific to this matter should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3205.



Alesia M. Brown
Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions

¹ The AIPA is title IV of the Intellectual Property and Communications Omnibus Reform Act of 1999 (S. 1948), which was incorporated and enacted as law as part of Pub. L. 106-113. The Conference Report for H.R. 3194, 106th Cong. 1st Sess. (1999), which resulted in Pub. L. 106-113, does not contain any discussion (other than the incorporated language) of S. 1948. A section-by-section analysis of S. 1948, however, was printed in the Congressional Record at the request of Senator Lott. See 145 Cong. Rec. S14,708-26 (1999) (daily ed. Nov. 17, 1999).